UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

THOMAS MACLEOD, (Plaintiff),))	
V. DONALD KERN, Et als., (Defendants).) C.A. No. 03-11483-NMG	

PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO THE DOC DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY DISCOVERY

Now comes the above plaintiff and moves this Honorable Court through this Opposition ${\hbox{\tt NOT}}$ to Stay Discovery. For the reasons below.

The defendants Hall, Mitchell and Brady ("DOC"), have motioned the court to Stay Discovery, (11-21-04). However, the Court, (Bowler, Magistrate Judge), Required the DOC defendants to Respond to interrogatories by October 29,2004. See docket number 64.

These DOC defendants allege that they filed a Motion for Summary Judgement, however the plaintiff has <u>not</u> been served with any Motion for Summary Judgement as they purport. Would "reveal" that his claims are, "not only meritless but frivolous". The rest of the defendants phantamagorical allegations likewise are speculation or, day dreams; "All information needed to decide this case is provided in defendants papers".

THEREFORE, in the interest of justice no Stay should be allowed to discovery. The defendants Ex Parte motion for Summary Judgement is a baseless and fraudulent pleading.

By the Plaintiff, Thomas MacLeod P.O. BOX 100

P.O. BOX 100 South Walpole, MA.

November 25,2004